Continuing Education

A National Assessment of Faculty Hiring Criteria and Procedures in Health Education Programs

Liliana Rojas-Guyler, Keith A. King, and Randall Cottrell

ABSTRACT

This study assessed current criteria and procedures used when hiring health education faculty. One hundred thirty-two program heads/coordinators of health education programs listed in the AAHE 2001 Directory of Institutions completed a mailed 45-item survey on hiring criteria and procedures. Results indicated that 90% of programs had conducted a search since 1995 with 71% hiring a faculty member. Twenty-nine percent were unable to complete their search due to lack of quality candidates, funding issues, or other reasons. Although 62% required interview candidates present research at the interview, only 36% required candidates to teach an actual class. The hiring criteria perceived as most important were desire to teach, health education doctorate, teamwork willingness, demonstrated teaching/presenting ability, and teaching experience. In addition, differences existed based on program type. Programs with graduate degrees had significantly greater numbers of tenure track positions and positions held by tenured faculty, individuals with doctoral/terminal degrees in health education, and individuals with CHES certification. Programs offering graduate degrees were significantly more likely to place emphasis on research experience, whereas programs offering only undergraduate degrees were more likely to place emphasis on teaching experience. Based on these findings, programs may wish to examine possible incongruities between their hiring criteria and actual interviewing procedures.

> American colleges and universities are facing their most difficult challenge since World War II in finding qualified faculty to teach our students and administrators to manage and lead our institutions of higher education. And yet, our institutions are vastly inexperienced and untrained in the art of identifying, recruiting, and hiring faculty and administrators (Stein & Trachtenberg, 1993, p. 9).

This statement would seem to be as relevant today as it was 10 years ago. Having been involved in several health education faculty searches that failed to yield large pools of qualified candidates and ended with decisions to postpone hiring and reopen the search process, we were interested in the hiring experiences and practices of other health education programs.

An Internet search of "faculty and hiring" produced numerous hits from various colleges and universities outlining their hiring policies and procedures (University of Maine, 2000; University of Washington, 2003). Most of these sites were general sites that focused on hiring practices for the entire university. Some sites, however, were content area specific (Brunn, 1990). Several sites discussed the need to increase diversity among faculty and contained plans or initiatives to do so (Georgia State University, 1997; University of Wisconsin, 2002).

No specific sites were found related to the challenges involved in hiring health promotion/education faculty nor the specific hiring policies or practices used by health education departments. Three journal articles were found that specifically

Liliana Rojas-Guyler, PhD, CHES; Keith A. King, PhD, CHES; and Randall Cottrell, EdD, CHES are with the Health Promotion and Education at the University of Cincinnati, ML 002, PO Box 210002, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002; E-mail: liliana.guyler@uc.edu.

mentioned faculty hiring and health education. The first article provided information on how to build a strong health and human performance program within an academic setting (Zauner, 1998). As part of this discussion a brief section was presented on seeking and retaining the best faculty and staff. Suggestions were made to utilize faculty and staff to identify program needs when developing the position statement and to carefully form search committees to represent various faculty factions. The second journal article provided information regarding the procedures used to hire health education faculty (Baker & Cissell 1994). It documented changes in advertised job requirements for health education faculty from 1972 to 1992. Results revealed an increased frequency in requiring a doctoral degree, research experience, résumés and transcripts, and letters of recommendation over this time period.

The third journal article specifically related to health education focused on the preferred qualifications for entry-level tenure-track health education positions (Moore, Pealer, Weiler, & Seabert, 1999). In surveying search committee chairpersons during the 1997/98 academic year the most important qualifications appeared to be college teaching experience followed by research experience. Of those committee chairpersons responding, close to two-thirds reported successfully filling the position. Fifty percent of search committee chairpersons at Research I/II institutions and 77% of search committee chairpersons at non-Research I/II institutions described their applicant pools as being average to below average.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to assess the current criteria and procedures utilized by U.S. colleges and universities to hire faculty in health education programs. This study provides information on the current criteria and procedures that health education programs use to evaluate prospective faculty members. It also provides information on frequency and success of faculty hiring searches. Findings of this study are significant because they provide insight on the various academic hiring criteria and professional expectations programs have for faculty candidates. These results identify hiring and interview guidelines that can be useful for graduating doctoral students seeking faculty positions, current faculty desiring to transfer between institutions, and administrators and faculty responsible for hiring new health education faculty.

In conducting this study, five subproblems were identified. They were (1) to identify the frequency with which U.S. universities conduct searches to fill health education faculty positions, (2) to determine the success of recent searches to fill health education faculty positions by U.S. universities, (3) to identify current interview practices and criteria used by U.S. universities in their recent searches to fill health education faculty positions, (4) to determine the importance of various hiring criteria among U.S. colleges and universities in their search for health education faculty members, and (5) to identify differences in hiring practices and criteria based on program type.

METHODS

Participants for this study included department heads, program directors, and program coordinators at university or college health education programs in the United States that were listed in the *Directory of Institutions Offering Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs in Health Education* (American Association for Health Education, 2001). Within this directory, institutions listed are self-identified as providers of health education programs. In February of 2003 survey packets were sent to the designated department head/program coordinator of these institutions (N=223). A cover letter described the purpose of the study, the voluntary and confidential nature of participant responses, and the significance of institutional participation in the success of the study. This letter was addressed to the department coordinator, department head, or individual most capable of responding to the survey questions. A 45-item survey and a self-addressed stamped envelope were included. Institutions that did not respond were sent a follow-up letter, another survey and a self-addressed stamped envelope approximately 6 weeks after the initial mailing.

The survey instrument contained items designed to address program demographics, frequency of searches, type of searches, response rates, and quality of applicant pools. Reported procedures for the interview process and importance given to candidate qualifications in hiring considerations were also measured.

Six items assessed the year in which the last search was conducted, the level of search performed, the number of completed applications, the number of eligible completed applications, the outcome of the search, and reasons why any searches had been suspended or shutdown. Three items assessed the qualification levels of candidates, the satisfaction of the institution with both the quantity and quality of applications received, and the total number of candidates interviewed. Two separate items identified procedures for the interview process such as with whom candidates met and the type of presentations made by candidates.

A 4-point Hiring Criteria Scale was created to measure the importance of 18 hiring criteria used by institutions in tenure-track searches. Participants were requested to rate their level of perceived importance of the 18 hiring criteria for their last faculty search by using the following four-point scale: 1=*unimportant (was not considered in the search)*, 2=*desirable (was somewhat important)*, 3=*preferred (was extremely important)*, and 4=*mandatory (had to be present to hire)*. Additionally, a series of 13 questions assessed program characteristics.

A panel of health promotion professors (n=4) assessed the survey for content and face validity. All suggested changes were incorporated into the final survey. Internal consistency and reliability on the Hiring Criteria Scale was established at .84 using Cronbach alpha. Data analysis was

conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software with a significance level set at p=.05. Analyses included frequency statistics, measures of central tendency, chi-square, and analyses of variance.

RESULTS

A total of 223 surveys were sent out nationwide to health education and promotion programs. However, 11 were omitted from the study because they reported having no such program, had an undeliverable address, or did not have tenure-track faculty positions. The return rate for the survey was 62% (n=132). Of the 132 institutions responding to the survey, 39% (n=51) were programs offering an undergraduate degree only. The remaining 61% (n=81) offered both undergraduate and graduate programs or only graduate programs in health education.

The first purpose of the study was to identify the frequency with which U.S. universities conduct searches to fill health education faculty positions. One hundred and eleven (90%) of the 123 participants who responded to this question had conducted their most recent health education faculty search since 1995. Seventy-eight (63%) had conducted their most recent health education faculty search since the 2000/2001 academic year. Only 12 programs (10%) had not conducted a health education faculty search since 1995 (Table 1). Ninety-seven percent (n=118) of the recent searches were at the national or international level, whereas only 3% (n=4) were limited to the local or regional level.

A second purpose of the study was to determine how successful recent searches had been in identifying and recruiting qualified applicants. Based on the respondents to this survey the number of completed applications in the last faculty search ranged from a low of two to a high of 88. The largest number of respondents (n=55; 49%) indicated they had received 15 or fewer completed applications in their last search. Another 40 respondents (36%) received between 16 and 30 completed applications. Only 17 programs (15%) received more than 30 completed applications (Table 1). Overall the mean number of completed applications was 19.59 (n=112).

Table 1. Characteristics of Last Faculty Search

Item	*N*	%
Academic Year of Last Conducted Search[A]		
2002/2003	15	12.2
2001/2002	43	35.0
2000/2001	20	16.3
1999/2000	13	10.6
1998/1999	6	4.9
1997/1998	6	4.9
1996/1997	5	4.1
1995/1996	3	2.4
Prior to 1995/1996	12	9.8
Completed Applications for Last Search[B]		
0–15	55	49.1
16–30	40	35.7
31–45	13	11.6
46–60	3	2.7
61–85	0	0.0
86 or more	1	0.9
Completed Eligible Applications for Last Search[C]		
1–5	36	32.1
6–10	38	33.9
11–15	16	14.2
16–20	11	9.8
21–25	5	4.4
26–30	2	1.7
31 or more	4	3.5

Note: Individuals who did not respond to these items were not included in the analyses.
[A]*N*=123.
[B]*N*=112; mean=19.59.
[C]*N*=112; mean=10.87.

More important than the total number of completed applications received was how many of the completed applications met the minimum eligibility requirements for the position (Table 1). Two-thirds of the positions (66%) had 10 or fewer applicants to meet the eligibility requirements. One-third (32%) had fewer than 5 applicants to meet the eligibility requirements.

Ninety-four (71%) of the 132 respondents had successfully hired a new faculty member as a result of their most recent search. Another 12 respondents (9%) had to reopen and extend their searches but were ultimately able to fill the position. Of the 21 searches that did not end in hire, the reasons given were lack of qualified applicants, funding issues, or other nonspecified problems.

The third purpose of the study was to identify current interview practices and guidelines used by U.S. universities in recent searches to fill health education faculty positions. Institutions were asked with whom candidates met during their interviews. One hundred seventeen (97%) met with the department chair and 106 (88%) met with the faculty as a group. Sixty-five (54%) of interviewees met with faculty

members individually. One hundred eight (89%) of candidates met with the search committee as a group. In regard to meetings with students the majority of programs had their candidates meet with both undergraduate (62%) and graduate (53%) students. Administrators were also reported to be part of the interview meeting process with 115 (95%) candidates meeting with the dean of the college. Only a small percentage of institutions had their candidates meet with the provost (26%) and president (12%). Table 2 summarizes the meeting practices and guidelines reported by participating institutions. Additional meetings during interviews were reported with the representatives of the graduate school, human resources, the research office, academic affairs, the library, and the benefits office.

One hundred twenty-one respondents identified the type(s) of presentations required of candidates as part of the interview process. The majority (62%) reported research presentations as a requirement. Forty-three (36%) required the candidates to actually teach a class to students and 34 (28%) required a mock teaching presentation. Table 2 presents detailed information on types of presentations. Additional types of presentations reported by respondents included those focusing on an individual's goals, philosophy, and future expectations, and those focusing on curriculum and teaching methods (including videotaping live teaching presentations).

A fourth purpose of the study was to determine the importance of various hiring criteria among U.S. colleges and universities in their searches for health education faculty members. Respondents were requested to indicate their perceived importance of 18 hiring criteria via a 4-point scale (1=*unimportant*; 2=*desirable*; 3=*preferred*; 4=*mandatory*). Results indicated that the most important criteria used in hiring faculty were desire to teach, having a doctoral or terminal degree in health education, being willing to work as part of a team, having demonstrated teaching/presenting ability, and having teaching experience (Table 3). The least important criteria were having CHES certification, belonging to a professional organization, having provided community service, previous teaching evaluations, and grant experience.

Table 2. Meetings and Types of Presentations during the Interview Process

Interview Procedure	N	%
Committees/Individuals Candidates Meet During Interview[A]		
Departmental/Program		
Chair	117	96.7
Faculty as a group	106	87.6
Faculty individually	65	53.7
Search committee		
As a group	108	89.3
Individually	37	30.6
Students		
Undergraduates	75	62.0
Graduates	64	52.9
Administrators		
Dean of college	115	95.0
Provost	32	26.4
President	15	12.4
Other	17	14.0
Type of Presentation(s) Candidates Make during Interview[A]		
Presentation on candidate's research	75	62.0
Teach an actual class to students	43	35.5
Mock teaching presentation	34	28.1
No presentation is given	8	6.6
Other—explain	7	5.8

Note: N=121.
[A]Items had a "check all that apply" response format.

The final purpose of this study was to examine differences in hiring criteria based on type of degree offered by program. For the purpose of this analysis data were collapsed so comparisons could be made between programs that offer only an undergraduate degree with programs that offer some combination of graduate degrees either with or without an undergraduate degree offering. Results indicated that 51 (39%) programs offered undergraduate degrees only, whereas 81 (61%) offered a graduate degree. Compared with programs offering only undergraduate degrees, programs offering graduate degrees had a significantly greater number of tenure track positions [$F(1, 119)=10.57, p=.001$], number of positions held by tenured faculty [$F(1, 106)=13.22, p < .001$], number of positions held by individuals with doctoral/terminal degrees in health education [$F(1, 109)=11.37, p < .001$], number of positions held by individuals with CHES certification [$F(1, 85)=5.75, p=.019$], and number of positions replaced since 1995 [$F(1, 88)=11.43, p=.001$] (Table 4).

Chi-square analyses revealed that overall satisfaction in the number of applicants in the search did not differ significantly based on program type, whereas overall satisfaction in the quality of applicants in the search did differ significantly based on program type. More specifically, programs offering graduate degrees were significantly more satisfied with the quality of their applicants (n=50, 78%) than were programs

Table 3. Perceived Importance of Criteria Used in Last Faculty Search

Item	*N*	M	SD
Desire to teach	121	3.74	0.559
Doctoral or terminal degree in health education	124	3.63	0.680
Willingness to work as part of a team	122	3.59	0.689
Demonstrated teaching/presentation ability	124	3.56	0.678
Teaching experience	122	3.51	0.646
Desire to conduct research	124	3.26	0.953
Research experience	123	3.17	0.875
Professional publications	123	3.11	0.787
Evidence of research agenda	124	3.07	0.989
Professional presentations	122	3.03	0.781
Desire to be involved in professional service	123	2.88	0.855
Desire to be involved in community service	120	2.74	0.874
Professional service	122	2.68	0.774
Grant experience	122	2.65	0.832
Previous teaching evaluations	122	2.63	0.955
Community service	122	2.63	0.815
Professional memberships	122	2.58	0.908
CHES certification	120	2.42	0.950

Note: Means based on a 4-point scale (4=*mandatory*; 3=*preferre*d; 2=*desirable*; 1=*unimportant*)

offering undergraduate degrees only (n=14, 22% , χ^2=8.83, p=.003).

A series of crosstabulations revealed that most undergraduate and graduate degree offering programs shared similarities in who candidates met with during the interview process, with one exception (Table 5). Nearly two-thirds (64%) of programs offering graduate degrees required candidates to meet individually with department/program faculty compared with one-third (34%) of programs offering undergraduate degrees only. Regarding the actual type of presentation made during the interview, programs offering graduate degrees were more likely than programs offering undergraduate degrees only to require a research presentation (78% vs. 32%, respectively), whereas programs offering undergraduate degrees only were more likely than programs offering graduate degrees to require teaching to an actual class (49% vs. 29%, respectively).

Differences in hiring criteria based on program type were found. Based on analyses of variance, programs offering graduate degrees were significantly more likely than programs offering undergraduate degrees only to feel that the following factors were important in hiring: desire to conduct research [F(1, 1,22)=16.04, p<.001], research experience [F(1, 121)=13.78, p<.001], evidence of a research agenda [F(1,122)=15.60, p<.001], professional publications [F(1, 121)=6.65, p=.011], and grant experience [F(1, 120)=14.22, p<.001] (Table 6). Conversely, programs offering undergraduate degrees only were more likely than programs offering graduate degrees to feel that willingness to work as part of a team [F(1, 120)=4.52, p=.036], teaching experience [F(1, 120)=5.95, p=.016], desire to be involved in community service [F(1, 118)=4.77, p=.036], professional service [F(1, 1120)=7.28, p=.008], and community service [F(1, 120)=4.36, p=.039] were important hiring criteria.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results of this study, faculty searches in health education programs are a common occurrence. Ninety percent of programs responding to the survey had conducted faculty searches in the 8 years since 1995, with 63% having conducted a search since the 2000/2001 academic year. Although the number of completed applications for these positions may be smaller than desired, it would seem that the reported numbers of applications are adequate to conduct and complete a successful search. Seventy-one percent of the searches ended in a successful hire. Of greater concern than the number of completed applications, however, is the number of applications that met the minimum eligibility requirements for the position. With one-third of positions having 5 or fewer qualified applicants and another third having between 6 and 10 qualified applicants, it would seem that the pool of qualified applicants is not extensive. With the small number of qualified applicants and the high number of job openings, competition for qualified applicants is strong. This would, in part, account for the nearly 20% of programs that did not report a successful outcome to their most recent health education faculty search.

Although these numbers may not indicate a crisis in health education faculty hiring, they do indicate an imbalance in supply and demand. The outcome of this study confirms conversations with colleagues that there are not enough qualified doctoral-prepared health educators to fill the needs of academic institutions. These results suggest the need for doctoral degree-granting institutions to increase enrollments and/or for other programs to develop new doctoral degree programs in health education.

Further, academic institutions seeking new faculty need to aggressively recruit those qualified doctoral candidates that are available. Institutions need to provide salaries and resources that are competitive with other colleges and universities as well as government and private sector positions. They need to do a better job selling their programs and their institutions.

The results of this survey found that the majority of programs responding to the survey have similar practices and involved similar people interviewing potential tenure-track faculty. Meetings with department chairs, college deans, and search committees were nearly universal. Results also

Table 4. Significant Differences in Faculty Positions Based on Program Type

Item	Graduate Degree Program[A] M	Graduate Degree Program[A] SD	Undergraduate Degree Program[B] M	Undergraduate Degree Program[B] SD	*F*	*p*
Number of tenure-track positions	5.64	4.78	3.28	2.85	10.57	.001
Number of positions held by tenured faculty	4.42	3.15	2.34	1.71	13.22	.000
Number of positions held by individuals with doctoral/terminal health education degrees	4.25	3.47	2.26	1.43	11.37	.001
Number of positions held by individuals with CHES	2.39	1.42	1.71	0.94	5.75	.019
Number of positions replaced since 1995	2.33	1.38	1.41	0.68	11.43	.001

Note: Individuals who did not respond to these items were not included in the analyses.
Note: Means based on 4-point scale (1=*not important*; 2=*desirable*; 3=*preferred*; 4=*mandatory*)
[A]Graduate degree programs are defined as programs offering graduate degrees only and/or programs offering both graduate and undergraduate degrees (*N*=81).
[B]Undergraduate degree programs are defined as programs offering undergraduate degrees only (*N*=51).

indicated that a large majority of programs include both graduate and undergraduate students in the hiring process. Only 17 (14%) respondents specified additional meetings with other university personnel, which emphasizes the similarity of interview processes across the reporting institutions.

In regard to presentations made by candidates as part of the interview process, 66 (50%) institutions required teaching presentations (either real or mock). This means 50% of candidates did no teaching during the interview process. This seems to be incongruent with the high importance placed on teaching experience and desire. Of the five top-ranked criteria for hiring, number one was a desire to teach and number four was teaching experience. Moore and colleagues (1999) similarly found teaching to be an important criterion in hiring faculty members. It would seem faculty and search committees would want to observe the teaching/presentation skills of potential faculty members; yet in the present study only one in three (35.5%) required candidates to teach an actual class to students during the interview.

Although 75 (62%) institutions required research presentations, almost 40% did not. This is surprising because 4 of the top 10 rated hiring criteria included research. Perhaps some question whether observing a research presentation is a good measure of one's research ability and prefer to ask research-related questions in a different forum.

As aforementioned, the findings related to presentations during the interview process seem contradictory. Having potential faculty provide both research and teaching presentations would seem an important element in the interview process. Yet only about two-thirds (62%) required research presentations and half (51%) required teaching or mock teaching presentations. Such findings highlight the incongruities between program hiring criteria and program hiring practices. Actual reasons why more programs require research presentations than teaching presentations should be explored in future studies. Time limitations during the interview process may play some role in scheduling presentations during the interview process, but this does not fully explain why research presentations would be required more frequently than teaching presentations. If time were a true limitation, then both presentations might be eliminated or both might be required but shortened in length. Another potential explanation is that program search committees may feel teaching ability can be assessed through letters of recommendation and previous teaching experience as evidenced on the vita, whereas research ability can only be thoroughly assessed via live research presentations. Finally, pressure from the university administration to hire faculty with strong research skills may also affect the hiring practices of health education programs. Programs are strongly encouraged to hire individuals who show the potential to become productive researchers, obtain funding through research grants, and obtain tenure based largely on research productivity. Although teaching ability is recognized as important, administrative pressure to bring in quality researchers may have a stronger impact on the actual hiring practices.

The criteria deemed least important were professional memberships and CHES certification. Programs appeared to place much stronger emphasis on demonstrated academic skills, such as teaching and research, than membership or certification involvement. The necessity and importance of CHES certification has received much debate in the professional literature and on the HEDIR mail server. Respondents in this study reported that it was not an important factor used in hiring faculty members.

The present study also found several significant differences in hiring procedures and hiring criteria based on program type. For example, programs offering graduate degrees were more likely to require interview candidates to provide a research presentation, whereas programs offering undergraduate degrees only were more likely to require

Table 5. Interview Procedures Based on Program Type

Interview Procedure	Graduate Degree Program[A] *N* (%)	Undergraduate Degree Program[B] *N* (%)
Individuals/Committees Met During Interview		
Department/program		
Chair	78 (98%)	39 (95%)
Faculty as a group	72 (90%)	34 (83%)
Faculty individually	51 (64%)	14 (34%)
Search committee		
As a group	71 (89%)	37 (90%)
Individually	26 (33%)	11 (27%)
Students	58 (73%)	31 (76%)
Administrators		
Dean of college	77 (96%)	38 (93%)
Provost	17 (21%)	15 (37%)
President	2 (3%)	13 (32%)
Type of Presentation Made during Interview		
Research presentation	62 (78%)	13 (32%)
Mock teaching presentation	23 (29%)	11 (27%)
Teach an actual class to students	23 (29%)	20 (49%)
No presentation made	3 (4%)	5 (12%)

Note: Individuals who did not respond to these items were not included in the analyses.
[A]Graduate degree programs are defined as programs offering graduate degrees only and/or programs offering both graduate and undergraduate degrees (*N*=80).
[B]Undergraduate degree programs are defined as programs offering undergraduate degrees only (*N*=41).

interview candidates to teach an actual lesson to a class of students. With respect to hiring criteria, programs offering graduate degrees placed a much greater emphasis on research skills, whereas programs offering undergraduate degrees only placed much greater emphasis on teaching experience and service. Such findings are not surprising given the fact that many graduate degree programs are housed within Research I universities and thus have research and grant-obtaining activities established as a major priority area. In addition, compared to programs offering only undergraduate degrees, programs offering graduate degrees tend to require faculty to become more involved in research activities as a means of gaining tenure, to teach more graduate courses focusing on research and statistical skills, and to require faculty to serve on student theses and dissertation committees.

Although these findings appear to be straightforward and readily explained, they do tend to highlight the differences between programs that offer only undergraduate degrees and those that also offer graduate degrees. Such information could be beneficial to doctoral candidates in helping them decide to which type of program to apply. The findings of this study appear to indicate that individuals who want to devote most of their time and effort to teaching and service while devoting little time to research may be best suited to programs offering only the undergraduate degrees. Conversely, those wishing to devote a sizeable percentage of their time and effort to research may be best suited to considering programs offering graduate degrees.

Finally, the limitations to this study should be noted. First, no information was collected regarding the reasons for open faculty positions. It would be interesting to know if faculty positions were the result of retirements, new position lines, people leaving the profession, or other possible reasons. Future studies should explore this issue in greater detail. Second, a sizable percentage (38%) of program heads/coordinators did not respond, resulting in a potential nonresponse bias. Thus, caution should be taken when attempting to generalize the findings of this study to all programs. Third, this study is limited by the accuracy of the AAHE directory. Some institutions offering health education degrees may have not been listed, and possible changes in leadership may have not been reflected on the directory. Fourth, this study did not examine whether hiring criteria differed based on Research I or Research II classifications. Future studies may wish to investigate these possible differences. Finally, the closed-ended format of the majority of questions in this survey may have limited response options, failing to obtain useful information. Additional studies may wish to collect solely qualitative data in order to more thoroughly understand faculty hiring criteria and procedures.

REFERENCES

American Association for Health Education. (2001). Directory of institutions offering undergraduate and graduate degree programs in health education. *American Journal of Health Education, 32*, 154–168.

Baker, J. A. & Cissell, W. B. (1994). Professionalism and academic job announcements in health education. *Wellness Perspectives, 10(4)*, 40–47.

Brunn, S. D. (1990). Hiring, evaluation, promotion and tenure decisions in a U.S. geography department. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 14*, 111–122.

Georgia State University. (1997). *Diversity plan*. Retrieved October 7, 2003, from http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwpef/policies/diversity.htm

Moore, M. J., Pealer, L. N., Weiler, R. M., & Seabert, D. M. (1999). A survey of search committee chairpersons: Candidate qualifications

Table 6. Hiring Criteria Based on Program Type

Hiring Criteria	Graduate Degree Program[A] M	SD	Undergraduate Degree Program[B] M	SD	*F*	*p*
Desire to teach	3.68	.634	3.84	.374	2.227	.138
Health education doctoral degree	3.65	.727	3.58	.587	.321	.572
Teaching/presenting ability	3.51	.709	3.67	.606	1.742	.189
Desire conduct research	3.49	.853	2.81	.982	16.039	.000
Willingness to work as a team	3.49	.766	3.77	.480	4.519	.036
Teaching experience	3.41	.651	3.70	.599	5.947	.016
Research experience	3.38	.832	2.79	.833	13.776	.000
Evidence of a research agenda	3.32	.920	2.60	.955	16.599	.000
Professional publications	3.23	.795	2.86	.718	6.650	.011
Professional presentations	3.10	.810	2.91	.718	1.732	.191
Grant experience	2.84	.829	2.27	.708	14.218	.000
Desire in professional service	2.79	.896	3.05	.754	2.601	.169
Desire in community service	2.62	.901	2.98	.780	4.769	.030
Professional service	2.54	.813	2.93	.632	7.277	.008
Previous teaching evaluations	2.53	.931	2.81	.982	2.462	.119
Community service	2.52	.845	2.84	.721	4.361	.039
Professional memberships	2.49	.946	2.74	.819	2.141	.146
CHES certification	2.32	.919	2.62	.987	2.737	.101

Note: Individuals who did not respond to these items were not included in the analyses.
Note: Means based on 4-point scale (1=*not important*; 2=*desirable*; 3=*preferred*; 4=*mandatory*)
[A]Graduate degree programs are defined as programs offering graduate degrees only and/or programs offering both graduate and undergraduate degrees (*N*=80).
[B]Undergraduate degree programs are defined as programs offering undergraduate degrees only (*N*=41).

preferred for entry-level tenure-track health education faculty positions. *Journal of Health Education, 30*, 297–302.

Stein, R. H., & Trachtenberg, S. J. (Eds.). (1993). *The art of hiring in America's colleges & universities*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

University of Maine at Farmington. (2000). *Personnel policies and procedures for faculty*. Retrieved November 19, 2002, from http://www.umf.maine.edu/Personnel/hiring/fac%20p&p%201200.htm.

University of Washington. (2003). *Faculty recruitment toolkit.* Retrieved October 6, 2003, from http://www.washington.edu/admin/eoo/forms/ftk_01.html.

University of Wisconsin. (2002). *Faculty strategic hiring initiative.* Retrieved October 7, 2003, from http://www.provost.wisc.edu/hiring/facshi.html.

Zauner, C. W. (1998). Building a strong academic program at East Carolina University: Practical experiences. *Quest (Human Kinetics), 50,* 206–212.